

14028. Adulteration of spaghetti, egg noodles, hominy, peanuts, and mincemeat. U. S. v. 9 Cases of Spaghetti, et al. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. Nos. 20602, 20603, 20604, 20605, 20606. I. S. Nos. 4337-x, 4338-x, 4339-x, 4340-x, 4341-x. S. Nos. C-4861, C-4861-a, C-4861-b, C-4861-c, C-4861-d.)

On November 12, 1925, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 9 cases of spaghetti, 4 cases of egg noodles, 2 cases of hominy, 20 cases of peanuts, and 2 cases of mincemeat, remaining in the original unbroken packages at St. Louis, Mo., alleging that the articles had been shipped by the Renfro Supply Co., Williamsburg, Ky., on or about October 1, 1925, and transported from the State of Kentucky into the State of Missouri, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

Adulteration of the articles was alleged in the libel for the reason that they consisted in whole or in part of filthy, decomposed, and putrid vegetable substances.

On January 9, 1926, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the products be destroyed by the United States marshal.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

14029. Adulteration of canned string beans. U. S. v. 37 Cases, et al., of Canned String Beans. Default decrees of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. Nos. 20620, 20621, 20631, 20716, 20718. I. S. Nos. 4234-x, 4243-x, 4263-x, 4264-x. S. Nos. C-4868, C-4874, C-4911, C-4914.)

On November 14 and 19 and December 12 and 14, 1925, respectively, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Oklahoma, acting upon reports by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district libels praying the seizure and condemnation of 368 cases of canned string beans, in various lots, at Duncan, Waurika, Chickasha, Henryetta, and Poteau, Okla., respectively, alleging that the article had been shipped by the Litteral Canning Co., Fayetteville, Ark., in various consignments, namely, on or about August 22 and 24 and September 5 and 8, 1925, respectively, and transported from the State of Arkansas into the State of Oklahoma, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: (Can) "Our Favorite Brand" (or "Faycano") "Cut Stringless Beans * * * Packed by Litteral Canning Co. Fayetteville, Ark."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libels for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy, decomposed, or putrid vegetable substance.

On January 16 and 18, 1926, respectively, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

14030. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U. S. v. 613 Pails of Butter. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture entered. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 20240. I. S. No. 22358-v. S. No. C-4775.)

On or about June 30, 1925, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Louisiana, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 613 pails of butter, remaining in the original unbroken packages at New Orleans, La., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Harrow-Taylor Butter Co., Kansas City, Mo., on or about June 11, 1925, and transported from the State of Missouri into the State of Louisiana, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a substance deficient in butterfat had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce or lower or injuriously affect its quality or strength and had been substituted in part for the said article.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the article was an imitation of or offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article, in that it was offered for sale under the name of butter, whereas it was not butter, not